India

FOR THE

No. 176. New Series. No. 270. Old Series. WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, MAY 17, 1901. [Registered as a Newspaper. Price...... 2d By Post, 2½d

Notes and News ... 229	Indian Nationality: Sermon by the Bishop of Bombay ... 235
What of the Famine? ... 232	Correspondence between Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Lord G. Hamilton ... 237
Our London Letter ... 233	Indian Affairs in Parliament ... 238
Notes from Bombay ... 234	Advertisements ... 240
The Famine in India ... 234	

NOTES AND NEWS.

WE reprint elsewhere a considerable part of the notable sermon preached in St. Paul's Cathedral by the Bishop of Bombay at the annual service of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. It would be beyond our province to discuss Dr. MacArthur's main conclusion, or to remark upon the general work of missionaries in India. But it is a pleasant duty to recognise the fair and sympathetic temper in which he regards the attitude and aspirations of educated India and of the Indian National Congress. Nothing could be better than the spirit in which he approaches his subject:—

I speak with the heart-felt respect of one who has conceived a high esteem for the people of India, and whose ambition is, if God will, to understand them, to deserve and to win their friendship, to serve them with wisdom and with sympathy in all departments of their social life, and to be a fellow-worker with them in all that may further their national welfare.

Their "national" welfare, observe. So, too, Dr. MacArthur chooses for the title of his discourse, "Christianity and Indian Nationality." He sees among the Indians, as among the Jews, "the craving for independence, for liberty, for recovered nationality, for powers and opportunities of self-government according to indigenous views and instincts."

Among the educated (he says), those who are the natural leaders of the people, whose lives are identified with India, who have nothing to look for from Western sources, whose only prospects lie in the progress of their country, the craving is deep and strong.

This craving, Dr. MacArthur thinks, "explains the restlessness which is observable on the surface of Indian life, the discontent, the fretfulness, the disposition to criticise, the tone of bitterness, the temper of suspicion and seeming unfriendliness."

It is easy to mistake the significance of these things, to interpret them as evidences of a seditious spirit and an attitude of disloyalty to our Government. I am convinced that they mean no such thing. The proofs of widespread, strong, intelligent loyalty are far more general and conclusive than any seeming indications of an opposite spirit. The people are fully conscious of the advantages they owe to us. If they do not exactly like the foreigner, they esteem and trust him all the same.

He cites the eagerness of the chiefs and the leading men to help us in every time of need, and mentions especially the aspect of Bombay on the day of the funeral of Queen Victoria. Dr. MacArthur proceeds:—

The minds which we have enlightened and educated, to which, through intimate contact with them, we have imparted our ideas, and some of our characteristics and capabilities, feel that they are fettered and restricted. They think that they cannot attain what their abilities and acquirements would command in other circumstances. They are sensitive, and no doubt, to some extent, they exaggerate their privations. They ask themselves why they should not be as other people, with a fair field, with free opportunities. They have seized a political ideal, viz., that of self-government under British paramountcy. . . . . We cannot censure the ideal.

Indeed Dr. MacArthur goes further. "The accomplishment of what is desired," he says, "would surely be in harmony with English ideas and aims."

The training of a wise, intelligent, and responsible people, united among themselves and capable of self-government, would be the triumph of English administration in India. In present circumstances it may seem a distant goal, but it is one to remember and to strive towards. Each generation ought to make its contribution and record its advance in the right direction.

The task before Indians is "one of discipline and education." Elsewhere Dr. MacArthur speaks of "the energy of Congress with its modified, enlightened, and more reasonable tone." The proposals of the Congress appear modified and tentative indeed by comparison with the ideal of "self-government under British paramountcy," of which he speaks. But, whatever the distant future may have in store, the political and economic reforms which the Congress has marked out are the first steps in the right direction. As for the opportunities of the Christian religion in India, it need only be said that example is better than precept. When individuals and nations professing Christianity exhibit the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount, the task of winning converts will, doubtless, be easier.

The Government scheme for the organisation of the British Army is likely to afford an opportunity for a debate on Indian affairs. Mr. Caine has given notice of an amendment to Mr. Brodrick's motion in the following terms:—

Line 1, leave out from "That," to the end of the Question, in order to add "in view of the increasing difficulty experienced in recruiting for the British Army, and the present employment of 30,000 troops of the Indian Army outside the frontiers of India, it should form part of any scheme of Army organisation that 20,000 of the British troops enlisted for India should in future form part of the Army Corps to be organised in the United Kingdom."

In view of the large number of amendments upon the Order Paper it is possible that Mr. Caine will not be able to move his amendment. But that will not necessarily prevent him from making a speech urging the injustice which the present Army system inflicts upon the Indian taxpayer.

In the debate on the Civil List in the House of Commons (May 9) Mr. John Burns supported Mr. Labouchere's amendment, proposing to reduce the annual sum allowed from £470,000 to £415,000. In the course of his speech Mr. Burns said:—

With famines in India, with a sugar tax and a coal tax, with a war sure to involve us in as much expenditure in the future as it had done in the past, and with a period of unemployment upon us, it seemed to him that those in high places ought to set a good example, and not ask for increases of salary. If he were satisfied that the King would get this money he should probably hesitate to vote against it, but it would go in useless and stilted Court functions, of which we had had too much. He suggested that the King could obtain an extra £50,000 or £60,000 a year by cutting down the number of officers of the Household, whose salaries now amounted to £125,000. The reign of her late Majesty, he contended, emphatically contradicted the statement that more money was needed.

We referred last week to Mr. Thorburn's "Report on Peasant Indebtedness and Land Alienations to Moneylenders in part of the Rawalpindi Division." Mr. Caine on Thursday last asked Lord George Hamilton to lay the Report, with the Appendices, upon the Table of the House. Lord George Hamilton, as will be seen from our Parliamentary report, demurred on the ground of expense, but in response to a further question from Mr. Caine undertook to present a copy in such a manner that members of the House of Commons can see it. This is good so far as it goes. The document will then become public and may, we presume, be cited. But we should like to repeat our suggestion of last week—namely, that, as a considerable number of copies are no doubt available in India, some of these might be sent home and presented to Parliament "by the simple expedient of putting the requisite blue cover upon the pages." This plan is already followed in regard to many Blue-books, the main contents of which

have already appeared as Government publications in India.

The Bombay Government has lately published "Selections from the Records" concerning two talukas, Jalalpur and Bulsar, in the Surat district of Guzerat. The papers chiefly belong to the year 1899, and, therefore, to a time when the famine had not reached its height; and the "Times of India" declares that these two talukas "are in some respects more favourably situated than any other parts of Guzerat." In Bulsar only one-half of the population (50.85 per cent.) are engaged in agriculture, a much smaller proportion than is usual in India. Many belonging to low castes find good employment in Bombay, and are able to send money to their families. These castes are, therefore, generally flourishing. But it is far otherwise with the agriculturists. The Anavlas have, according to Mr. Weir, the Collector, admittedly deteriorated during the time of the expiring settlement, and Mr. Lely agrees with him. It can no longer be said of them, as was said in the past, that "they live in good houses, and have plenty of cattle, implements, and capital."

In Jalalpur the decrease in prosperity is more marked. The numbers of the plough-cattle have fallen from 13,855 in 1872 to 9,144. Agriculturists who formerly had a pair of bullocks often have only one now, and have to borrow a second for ploughing. This, as Mr. Lely reminds us, means "stinted husbandry." Notwithstanding the excellent quality of lands, the assessment is declared to have been high, and "there is risk of land going out of cultivation if the assessment is raised" in a particular group of villages. The "Times of India" expresses its regret that the Bombay Government insisted on believing that "everything was making for the best in both talukas, and that they passed by with marked reluctance and regret the opportunity of securing an enhanced assessment from the two talukas."

Last August Mr. A. Rogers addressed to the Viceroy a comprehensive letter "sketching out the main outlines on which an equitable settlement of the land revenue in India should be made." We are not aware what reception has been accorded to it, and can only hope it will bear its legitimate fruit in due season. Mr. Rogers thinks it "very strange that there has never been any attempt made to bring the assessment of land to the Land Revenue in India under some comprehensive system, so far as this might be found practicable where the tenures of land vary so greatly as they do in different Provinces." The blame that has been laid on the land revenue administration in connexion with the recent famines affords, he imagines, an opportunity for "laying down authoritatively some rules for general guidance." Mr. Rogers suggests specially a direct order to prevent the raising of the demand on landlords, or intermediaries of whatever name, beyond the theoretical limit—a process illustrated by Mr. Romesh Dutt and from Mr. Rogers's own experience. "The first principle to be laid down in an equitable settlement," says Mr. Rogers, "is that the distance of villages from market and the average rainfall should have due weight given to them—matters which are overlooked when their rent-paying capacity is judged from the standpoint of outward condition." The other particular points he mentions would probably be alleged to be always officially considered: his main contention is for a wider basis of decision than is generally adopted, as against "patchwork assessment, that is, when isolated villages or small tracts of country are settled without reference to others in the immediate neighbourhood, or the assessment of which should be dominated by circumstances common to them all."

Passing from general points, Mr. Rogers considers "what should not be taken into account, owing to the impossibility of procuring reliable data to go upon." He objects to any attempt to lay down a hard and fast rule for ascertaining the actual produce of individual fields and its money value; to lay down the percentage—a third, a fourth, a sixth, etc.—that should be taken of crops in general; or to estimate the expense of cultivation over any large tract of country. All these things are attempted in Madras; and the attempt "has resulted in failure, of which a more striking proof could not be brought forward than the bare fact that with a teeming agricultural population more than 6,000,000 acres of arable land are now lying waste." The only reasonable valuation is relative, on a careful classification of soils. Then how to fix the assessment? By experience of the result of previous assessments. Thus:—

> If the prosperity of the people has fallen off under this burden; if land has gone out of cultivation, and collections of the revenue have been made with difficulty and only by the use of coercive processes, such as the sale of the land and personal property of defaulters; if, short of this, remissions of revenue have had to be given in ordinary seasons when the rainfall has been fair and no unusual calamities have overtaken the crops, we may be sure that the general level of the assessment has been too high and should be lowered. And vice versa. With this infallible guide, it is not difficult to fix a maximum which, thrown on the lands that have been relatively classified, will produce a fair average rate that will duly preserve the rights of the State and satisfy the tenants.

Mr. Rogers indicates grounds of occasional modification. While defending "the upper ranks of the service" (on "a priori" grounds, however), he yet insists that tenants must not be taxed on their improvements, or landlords either. Of course, he entirely concurs in Mr. Dutt's protest against the levying of compulsory water rates; and he doubts the wisdom of hurrying towards permanent settlements. Mr. Rogers's experience should secure very serious attention to his suggestions.

The "Pioneer," in its comments on the judgment of the High Court in the Noakhali case, has nothing but praise for the severe condemnation pronounced on Mr. Pennell's conduct in using his judgment as a means of attacking his superiors, and in appending to the record several documents which could not be considered as evidence. Our contemporary finds the secret of Mr. Pennell's action in a ludicrous idea which, it thinks, he had conceived that the authorities bore him a grudge "as the intrepid defender of judicial independence and the proclaimed apostle of justice and truth." But the Noakhali case in its larger issues can never be separated from the Chupra case; and seen in the light of that case, Mr. Pennell's idea is not so ludicrous. The High Court had to consider the Noakhali case by itself and in its bare legal aspects. But it is probable that the public will go far beyond these. Even the "Englishman," while treating Mr. Pennell's judgment as outrageous burlesque, admits that the judicial side of the case "unhappily" is "comparatively insignificant." We are also told that the case "from its inception to its sequel reflects very little credit upon our methods of administration."

But the strangest sequel of all is found in the report of another judgment also delivered at Noakhali, and by no less a person than Mr. Pennell's successor. The High Court has quashed the proceedings drawn up by Mr. Pennell against Mr. Reily. But the triumph of that officer must be somewhat marred by the comments of Mr. Geidt, now Sessions Judge at Noakhali. Dealing with what is known as "the stolen note case," Mr. Geidt accuses Mr. Reily of ordering the suspension of one of the witnesses, the Head Mohurir Rajendra, on a charge of giving false evidence, without seeing the evidence, and solely on the report of two subordinates, one of whom the evidence implicated. Mr. Geidt adds: "A more effective way of discouraging his subordinates from giving evidence it would be difficult to imagine." Mr. Cargill, the district magistrate, who came into collision with Mr. Pennell, is also reflected on by Mr. Geidt, because the prisoner though arrested on August 8 was not brought before a magistrate till September 25, while the law requires that no accused person be kept in custody without trial for more than fifteen days. This illegal detention was authorised by the district magistrate.

In his speech on the Budget, Sir Antony MacDonnell alluded to a new scheme having for its object the relief of the rayat from the oppression of the police. The "Pioneer" declares that it is idle to deny that the police are not regarded as friends whose aid is to be sought against criminals, "but rather as themselves a class of licensed depredators, to invoke whose assistance is about

as pleasant and profitable an operation as disturbing a nest of hornets." Now this may be traced to two causes. First, the authorities demand results from the police which cannot be achieved "by honest straightforward investigation." Therefore, the force is driven to underhand and oppressive measures. Secondly, owing to the partition of estates, the impoverishment of hereditary zemindars, and the appearance of non-resident landlords, who have obtained the land by money-lending transactions, there is seldom in a village a man of sufficient weight to stand up to the Thanadar, while there are still fewer communities with sufficient cohesiveness to make a combined resistance.

Sir Antony's plan is to enlist the aid of the village headmen in the investigation of crime, and at the same time to use them as a check on the tyranny of the police. But this implies, according to the "Pioneer," a change in the position of the village headman. At present the headmen are constantly summoned to assist the thanadars, but only to be "bullied, abused, perhaps beaten," day after day, till the investigation is at an end. In fact, the headman is usually too weak to be of much use either in helping the police or in checking their oppressions. The headman must, therefore, be made stronger. How is this to be done? Our contemporary suggests that, however the village lands be sub-divided, there should be only one lambardar for the whole village. Here, then, is a real revenue headman. Let him also be headman in criminal matters, village munsiff, and president of the Village Sanitation Committee. There would thus be created an office of considerable power, expulsion from which would be felt as a disgrace, and such an officer might act as a check on the police.

A letter from Mehdi Hasan in the "Pioneer" is of great interest as showing the trend of Mahomedan thought in India. He begins by declaring the inferences drawn from one or two sentences in an ill-reported speech hardly warranted by his actual position. Mehdi Hasan, therefore, thinks it right to make his position clear, and he begins by reiterating four propositions: (1) India is prospering under British rule; (2) No unnecessary difficulties should be put in the way of the Government; (3) "Any attempt to transplant the political institutions which have grown up in England to India, where the social institutions (which are in every country the basis of all institutions) are widely different, is pretty sure to prove a failure"; (4) Mahomedans and Hindus alike respect the Congress leaders who are undoubtedly loyal, and intellectually in the first rank of Indian society. These statements hardly make him an opponent of the Congress. The first proposition, however doubtful it may seem to some, is not inconsistent with a belief that India would prosper more if the tribute were less. The second is a truism. The third, which we have quoted textually, is one that should ever be in the mind of the Indian reformer and can never be too often repeated. All attempts to introduce institutions into India merely because they have been successful in Europe should certainly be condemned.

But having thus cleared the way, Mehdi Hasan in the rest of his letter gives an almost unfailing support to the Congress. Condemning secret agitation, he thinks the estrangement of the Indians and Europeans, and the consequent isolation of the Government, make it necessary for Mahomedans to put their wants and grievances before the Government in a "calm, loyal, and dispassionate manner." The Moslem community no longer have anyone in the position of Sir Syed Ahmed, who at once enjoyed the confidence of the Government and of his own people. Moreover, the Congress propaganda is now carried on in a way much less objectionable to the political views of the Mahomedans than it was a few years ago. Has not then the time arrived for the Mahomedans to come forward to vindicate their position? and for that end, should they not come out of their isolation and make common cause with their Hindu brother? Finally, he declares that the policy of isolation is gradually losing its advocates.

While many Anglo-Indians are reviling the results of Western education in India, and are crying out that our whole educational policy has been a mistake, Lord Curzon at Aligarh has been giving utterance to sentiments of an exactly opposite character. He said:—

> If the British dominion in India were exterminated to-morrow, and if all visible traces of it were to be wiped off the face of the earth, I think that its noblest monument and its proudest epitaph would be the policy that it has adopted in respect of education. . . . . In my judgment it has not only been an enlightened policy, it has also been a wise one.

In this he was thinking, as it seems, especially of the way in which the British Government had offered education to all. But he goes on to declare that he agrees with the address which had just been presented to him that it was by education alone that the Mahomedans of India could hope "to recover any portion of their former sway." If he were a Mahomedan Prince anxious to benefit his co-religionists he would concentrate his attention on education. And he exhorted his hearers to press forward to "pluck the fruit of the tree of knowledge which once grew best in eastern gardens, but has now shifted its habitat to the west."

The "Englishman," though not the greatest or the most influential, perhaps the most intensely Anglo-Indian of all Anglo-Indian newspapers, has a short but noteworthy article on the "Spirit of the Native Press." It is devoted to a refutation of the common fallacy that because in India there is a great distance between the educated and the uneducated, therefore the Indian Press may be ignored. But the educated have in all ages been the leaders of the rest of the people; and where the Indian Press leads "the country will sooner or later follow." These are remarkable words in such a place, but what follows is stranger still. "It is a common fallacy among Europeans to suppose that the fighting races of India despise learning," and those who earn their living by the pen. The writer recalls the old ascendency of the Brahmins. The Indians of the present day are not likely to despise what is now the key of success. Nor must the influence which Babus and Munshis possess over gangs of labourers, often of a different religion, be forgotten. After reading this excellent article we are forced to wonder whether the divergence between educated and uneducated Indians is as great as that between the mass of Anglo-Indians and the writers in their favourite papers.

That the Indian railway companies pay little attention to the comfort of Indian passengers has long been recognised. One particular grievance was lately made the subject of a question by the Hon. Surendra Nath Banerjea in the Bengal Legislative Council. He asked whether the authorities of two railways (the E.B.S.R. and the E.I.R.) gave no facilities for the establishment at their stations of refreshment rooms for Indians. The former railway, it was said in answer, was already contemplating the erection of refreshment stalls at stations where passengers change, while the latter is already erecting them. The movement is, therefore, progressing, but it is pointed out by the "Tribune" that although everyone will welcome the opening of refreshment stalls for Indians, the change would be very unpopular if it meant the exclusion from the platforms of the venders who sell refreshments to the passengers in the carriages.

Remittances on India for 60 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications amounting to Rs. 2,58,80,000 were received at prices ranging from 1s. 3d. and 29-32nds to 1s. 3d. and 31-32nds. The following amounts were allotted—viz., in bills, Rs. 11,13,000 on Calcutta and Rs. 26,02,000 on Bombay, at an average of 1s. 3.911d., and Rs. 11,54,000 on Madras at an average of 1s. 3.919d.; and in telegraphic transfers, Rs. 9,92,000 on Calcutta and Rs. 1,39,000 on Madras at an average of 1s. 3.968d. Tenders for bills at 1s. 3d. and 29-32nds and for transfers at 1s. 3d. and 31-32nds will receive about 20 per cent. Last week remittances for Rs. 62,20,244 were sold for £413,133, making the total disposed of from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs. 3,18,16,733, producing £2,112,162. Next week 60 lakhs will again be offered.

WHAT OF THE FAMINE?

LAST week we drew attention to the strange absence of official information regarding the progress of the Famine in India. We pointed out that the last official telegram which appeared in the London newspapers was dated February 18. Now it is just three months since February 18, and as yet we have not even a quarterly official report. Why is this? If the Famine were over and done with there would be nothing to report, and nobody would be idly curious on the subject. But in hard fact the Famine is not by any means over—except in the sense in which, according to this peculiar Government, the South African war was "over" some six or seven months ago. In the official telegram of February 18 it was stated that there were still in receipt of relief no fewer than 211,000 persons, of whom 171,000 were located in the Bombay Presidency. Moreover, there was attached to these figures a gloomy forecast, which certainly did not prepare one for a dead stoppage of further information. "Greater pressure," we were told, "is expected in the affected area after the reaping of the scanty harvests there." Those of us who have been closely interested in the fate of the population in the grip of the Famine, and in the economic, financial, and social consequences of the disastrous visitation, would naturally like to hear something of the actual or probable outturn of "the scanty harvests," and to know something of the validity of the forecast of "greater pressure." True, one can pick up belated details from Indian journals. There we find that the numbers in receipt of relief in the middle of April were half as many again as in the middle of February. Whether we take the figures at "over 300,000 persons" (with the "Times of India," April 20) or at "just under 260,000 persons" (with the "Pioneer Mail," April 26), it is plain that there is only too much ground for uneasiness. The stress lies in Bombay Presidency. Let us look at the details furnished in the "Times of India" of April 27, which has come to hand this week. The Bombay total for the week ended April 13 is given at 253,190—a rise of 22,055 on the week preceding: the "Pioneer Mail" makes out a rise of 32,100, but the lower figure is still ominous. Now consider the details. "The numbers on relief, including dependants," says the "Times of India" (April 27), "have decreased in the Panch Mahals by 1,777, in Satara by 873, and in Broach by 90; while in the other districts they have increased as follows:—Kaira, 9,171; Ahmednagar, 3,412; Ahmedabad, 3,102; Sholapur, 2,816; Bijapur, 1,365; Poona, 723; Nasik, 386; Belgaum, 165; Dharwar, 113. The numbers in receipt of gratuitous relief in villages and poor houses have increased in all districts, except Dharwar and Ahmedabad, which show decreases of 151 and 40 respectively." That is to say, the decreases are notably small and few, while the increases are mostly large and widespread. The only glint of sunshine on this gloomy prospect seems to be the statement of the "Pioneer Mail" (April 26), that "reports from the famine districts of Bombay show that the crops have yielded more than was expected when the estimates of relief expenditure were framed." How far such relief goes does not particularly appear; only it seems to be something to be thankful for. But why, we ask again, are the people of this country not officially informed of the state of matters in the famine districts? Is it right to leave them under the wholly wrong impression that the famine is "over"?

We observe that the Lord Mayor of London has just received from the chairman of an Indian Famine Relief Committee at Cairo a remittance of £615 odd, including a donation of £100 from the Khedive. It is a substantial sum, and deserves corresponding gratitude. It brings up the Lord Mayor's Fund to £394,021. Moreover it signalises the fact that the Lord Mayor's Fund is only formally closed—though why it should be formally closed while the need not only remains but has become again more pressing we do not undertake to explain. When one has regard to the cessation of official telegrams—or rather the cessation of the publication of such telegrams in the home press, for we cannot suppose that the Governments of India and Bombay do not keep the India Office fully informed—and when one finds the Lord Mayor's Fund formally closed, one cannot avoid the conclusion that the India Office considers that the Famine in Bombay has ceased to interest or to concern the people of this country. Yet surely this is an astonishing conclusion to be driven to. Do we not remember the appalling situation spread out before the Lord Mayor in Lord George Hamilton's letter approving the belated opening of the Fund? Do we not remember the despairing appeal that followed from Lord Curzon? Have we not received from India even official accounts that showed how serious the situation was and left no room to doubt that the generosity of the British public was but as a drop in the bucket of Indian distress? Has the India Office, then, relaxed its efforts in this country? And if so, why? And if not, what is it doing? It might at the very least let the British people know the real state of the facts in the famine districts. The "Pioneer Mail" (April 26) tells us that "a number of civil and military officers and subordinates have been drafted into the affected districts." We wonder why—and especially why "military" officers, and what sort of "subordinates." The "Pioneer Mail" says the object is "to ensure full supervision." But why has the need for "full supervision" arisen? And what is the character of the "supervision"? Again we cannot tell. Apparently the British public need not concern itself about the matter. But does it mean mischief? Has it any connexion with such a state of society, consequent on the famine troubles, as is pictured so gruesomely in Mr. McCracken's Report on the remarkable expansion of Thagi and Dakaiti in Rajputana and Central India? If not, a definite explanation and assurance would be most welcome.

The situation continues to emphasise the unwisdom of resting content with mere devices for relief. If the result of the Famine Commission's enquiry should be to indicate any improvement in the Famine Code, perfect as it already is, or to discover any fresh means of mitigation of the disaster of famine, we shall hail it with deep gratitude. But when all has been done that can be done by human experience and ingenuity, there still faces us the imperative necessity of getting at the root of the matter, and that, as we have long and strenuously contended, is the prevention of famine. Either we can (to some extent at least) prevent famine or we cannot. We must take it as patent that the official view is that famine cannot be prevented; otherwise it would have been prevented, or at any rate definite steps towards prevention would have been taken. There is a strong non-official view, on the other hand, that famine can be substantially prevented; and those who take this view, or even conceive that there is a possibility, however dim, of its being right, insist that something ought to be attempted. The first thing, obviously, is the need of a searching enquiry into the causes of the rayat's inability—his increasing inability—to resist the first onset of famine. This idea is the basis of the proposed Famine Union that is now engaging the close attention of Sir William Wedderburn. Other independent observers have taken up the same position. Mr. Vaughan Nash drew the like conclusion from his personal experiences of the famine. Mr. William Digby, who has earned the clearest right to an authoritative opinion on the subject, has long pressed for such an enquiry, and this indeed was the very burden of his recent Letter to the Viceroy. It needs hardly be added in these pages that a thorough-going enquiry has been pressed with continuous persistence by the National Congress. Yet the India Office stands by the official Indian view, and declares an enquiry to be alike superfluous and impracticable.

Superfluous! Then where is the material that renders it superfluous? Is the necessary basis for the project laid away somewhere in the pigeon-holes of the Home Department in Calcutta? If so, why not bring out such materials and put an end to the controversy one way or another? But how is it credible that such information should be allowed to lie "in retentis" unused? The conflict is direct, and it is a conflict on a fact. Is the rayat a prosperous person, or is he, on the contrary, an impecunious, sowkar-bound, hopeless wretch? Surely it is of fundamental importance to settle that question of fact before any attempt is made to apply a remedy. When a doctor is called in to see a patient, one would be somewhat astonished if the patient's relatives resolutely prohibited the taking of his temperature. But that is pre-

cisely what the India Office is doing. While it asserts that the rayat is really all right, it is obvious to every independent observer that there is something very serious the matter with him; but the India Office firmly declares that it is wholly superfluous to take his temperature. It professes the utmost solicitude for his welfare, yet somehow it takes up an obstructive attitude towards the essential preliminaries to the very end it professes to desire. But the case has gone far beyond the point where mere assertion will serve. The enquiry is plainly necessary (unless the Indian Government produce convincing proofs, which it has not yet produced), and in no sense whatever superfluous. Impracticable? Why, the proposal of Sir William Wedderburn is simplicity itself. Nor does it involve any expense worth a moment's consideration. On this point, too, the Government is inconsistent. For, as we remarked last week, a very similar enquiry was conducted without great difficulty by Mr. S. S. Thorburn, the late Commissioner of the Rawalpindi division. So far as appears, then, the objections of the Government are clearly untenable, and we must hope that they are put forward as a mere screen to some actual official proceedings in the same direction.

We may now recall the words of Lord George Hamilton in the House of Commons on January 26, 1897, on Sir William Wedderburn's motion for "a full and independent enquiry into the condition of the masses of the Indian people with a view to ascertain the causes by reason of which they are helpless to resist even the first attacks of famine and pestilence." Lord George said:—

> I agree with the honourable Baronet that the opportunity this famine affords ought not to be allowed to pass without our taking every opportunity to enquire into and ascertain the best methods of protecting the people of India from the recurrence of similar calamities.

But any such enquiry formed no part of the instructions to the Famine Commission. Lord Curzon, however, we have been told, has addressed enquiries to the Local Governments, and "a study of their replies will enable him to decide whether further investigation is necessary." And, as the Resolution on the appointment of the Famine Commission states that "it would be manifestly undesirable to postpone the labours of the present Commission" until it should appear whether further investigation is necessary, we may, on the whole, cherish the hope that, after all, another Commission is in contemplation for the solution of this urgent question.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

Westminster, Thursday.

Disquieting reports as to the state of Lord Salisbury's health were current up to the moment of his arrival in London last Saturday night. Those rumours, it was said, were at once confuted by the robust appearance of the distinguished statesman. He looked brown and hearty, and seemed to be in excellent spirits. On Monday night he dropped in at the House of Lords, and in response to one of the numerous friends who hastened to offer their congratulations declared, in a voice intended for the public ear, that he was now perfectly well. Later in the evening Lord Salisbury dined with the Nonconformist Unionist Association, and delivered a short speech. The exertion must have proved something of a strain, for on the following day the Prime Minister, in the course of some observations in the House of Lords, betrayed symptoms of physical weakness which pained and even startled his hearers. His voice trembled in an unusual manner, and at times was quite inaudible. The impression left on the minds of all who were present was that Lord Salisbury's convalescence was still far from complete.

Somebody has said that a philosopher is one who prefers the truth to his system, which perhaps is as much as to say that the world has never seen a philosopher. The political world is certainly without any specimen of the kind. Everyone lately has been telling Mr. Brodrick the truth about his scheme of army reform, but the Minister for War declines to accept unpalatable counsel. He is a politician, not a philosopher, and accordingly prefers his system. His colleagues also are politicians. A few days ago Mr. Chamberlain, ignoring the trifling fact that most of the Parliamentary opposition to the Army scheme has been organised by Ministerialists, denounced Mr. Brodrick's critics as a pack of unpatriotic pro-Boers. Similarly, on Monday night the temperate and suggestive criticism of Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman was promptly assailed by Mr. Wyndham as "a party attack based on a party amendment."

This being the spirit in which a national problem has been discussed, to-night's division is certain to be of a strictly party character. Unionists who despise the scheme and who have actually denounced it in debate will vote for it in the lobby, with the result that proposals for which nobody has a good word to say will receive the apparent endorsement of a great Parliamentary majority.

As Mr. Winston Churchill is hailed in some quarters with ecstatic exuberance as a Prime Minister of the future, it may be useful to other aspirants for that position to indicate one of the chief qualities of the young statesman's eloquence. It may be described as ingenuous egotism. Mr. Churchill is a Parliamentarian of six months, yet in his really able speech of Monday night he contrived to suggest that if Sir Charles Dilke fulfilled the promise of his performance of that evening he would be heard of again, to pat Mr. Wyndham on the back, to quote with express approval some sentences from his late father's most famous deliverance, and to intimate that there were times when Lord Salisbury's advice was worthy of serious consideration. Ever since the House of Commons betrayed its lack of prescience by laughing the young Disraeli into silence, it has done penance by accepting precocity as a sign of genius. It is probably right in Mr. Churchill's case, but there was much in the solemnity of Monday night's performance and also in the extravagant eulogies of Tuesday morning to suggest that the Parliamentary atmosphere is inimical to a sense of humour.

Among those who played the distinguished part of auditors of the Army debate were Lord Roberts, Lord Spencer, Lord Londonderry, Lord Raglan, the Duke of Marlborough, and a score of other peers. There was at least one red-coat in the strangers' gallery, and several stalwart figures in khaki. The Ladies' Gallery must have presented a brilliant appearance on the first night of the debate, but owing to the envious grille its occupants alone are privileged to view the splendours of that preserve. Lady Curzon, the wife of the Viceroy of India, heard part of the discussion, while the Duchess of Marlborough and Mr. Winston Churchill's mother waited for hours before they were rewarded with what to them must have been in any event the oration of the evening.

Something like a dead set is being made against Sir Henry Fowler by the Nationalists aided by a section of the Liberal party. The ex-Secretary for India has so long enjoyed the praises of his political adversaries that he can scarcely be surprised if his nominal associates are inclined to look askance when he is put up as their spokesman. Human nature, perhaps, should be superior to such weaknesses. But, after all, it is only in angelic spheres that the repentant sinner is assured of the highest honours. Even if it were otherwise, doubts of the reality of Sir Henry's repentance are still too prevalent to sanction an unrestrained outburst of rejoicing. He has sung the praises of Mr. Chamberlain's policy in South Africa with a fervour unequalled even by its author. What should such a songster know of pounds, shillings, and pence? Moreover, many Liberals are strongly of opinion that to put Sir Henry Fowler forward as a prophet of retrenchment and reform is to invite a crushing and unanswerable retort from the enemy whose extravagance he has consistently encouraged.

If, in spite of the protests that have been raised, the front Opposition bench should persist in its determination to entrust Sir Henry Fowler with the duty of moving the Liberal amendment to the Finance Bill, that amendment must inevitably be defeated by an overwhelming majority. The Irish members have decided to give it no support, and their example is certain to be followed by a number of Liberals, including, it is anticipated, Mr. John Morley, and possibly Sir William Harcourt. Under the circumstances, the wisest course would be to withdraw the amendment altogether. But whatever happens, much mischief has already been done which will not soon be re-

medied. The rift within the lute instead of making the music mute has produced a worse result. It has led to so piercing a discord that the echo of it must for some time to come mingle satirically with talk of Liberal unity.

Seditious libel can no longer be regarded as an obsolete crime in the legal lexicon of the British Government. Resuscitated in India, it promptly made a reappearance in South Africa, and has now reared a vigorous head in Ireland. The panic-stricken action of the Irish Executive a few days ago in confiscating, under this plea, the issue of a weekly newspaper published in Dublin is generally condemned as a stupid blunder. The offending sheet contained a gross attack on the personal character of the King, to which no attention would have been paid but for the advertisement given to it by the fussy zeal of Mr. Wyndham. Owing, however, to the outcry raised by that gentleman, the nauseous rubbish promptly obtained world-wide notoriety. It is said that his Majesty has conveyed to the Government an unmistakable expression of his appreciation of their services.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

THE PENNELL AFFAIR—AND AFTER.

ANOTHER NOAKHALI CASE.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, April 27.

The Pennell incident is not yet closed, though the appeal in connexion with the original murder case has now been heard and finally disposed of. Opinions will, of course, differ on the ruling of the Appellate Court. Mr. Reily's case has also been disposed of. The two judges have cleared him of the charges made against him. Here the judicial proceedings have come to an end. What the effect of the judgment will be on the public mind I will not undertake to say at present. The drama, as it proceeds, will unfold it. From the point of view of the administration itself it looks as if some radical changes must follow for better or for worse. Recent judicial decisions in various parts of the country, where the Government is directly or indirectly concerned, are not all viewed with equanimity by the discerning. There is too often an under-current of officialism—something which suggests that the judiciary is growing less independent than was the case five years ago. A slow process of officialising seems to be going forward which bodes no good to the administration of justice. Justice is the one strong foundation of attachment between the rulers and the ruled. Whatever blots there may be on the policy of government in connexion with land revenue or excise, forests and salt, the police or the army, the masses have hitherto entertained a strong belief in the purity of British justice. The bench on the whole has hitherto remained firm, impartial and independent. But some recent cases have led the people to wonder whether even this branch of the administration is slowly going to be disintegrated under the noxious influence of the despotic Executive. The Chupra and the Noakhali cases have more than aroused popular suspicion as to the inviolability of justice. Secret orders and intrigues to hush up official acts of high-handedness, when revealed in our law courts, are not means whereby the dignity of justice can be maintained. It is for our rulers, who affect blindness in face of transparent facts, to pause and consider whether in the interests of their own permanent government of the country any suspicion regarding so fundamental a matter is desirable.

So strong is the love of Indians for equality before the law and impartial justice that whenever, under stress of public opinion, the Government is compelled to take notice of wrongful acts on the part of its servants and chastise them, there is universal praise. It would, therefore, be an evil day if ever our High Courts and the courts subordinate to them should appear to be made mere departments of State. Hence, I repeat, it is for our rulers to choose what mode of justice they prefer in the administration. If the judiciary were in the future to be recruited from a class of courtiers and dependants, then good-bye to justice.

As if Nemesis were dogging the footsteps of the executive we have another case, and that again at Noakhali. No sooner is Mr. Pennell dethroned than another severe judgment is pronounced from the same judgment seat on the same implicated officials. Mr. Geidt succeeded Mr. Pennell. Within a few short weeks a case is heard in connexion with the theft of currency notes. That old policeman, Osman Ali, is again the central figure, and Mr. Geidt says he has no doubt that he tampered with the numbers of the notes. Moreover, he thinks Mr. Reily is greatly to be blamed in the matter. Here is another pretty kettle of fish. Can it be that Mr. Geidt is also an indiscreet judge? There is nothing to show this. Here is Mr. Geidt's concluding judgment:—"I have now come to the end of my task. The materials which I have reviewed show that the conduct of Osman Ali in this case was highly unsatisfactory, and they raise a strong suspicion that both he and Kailash Chandra Deb have had something to do with the stolen notes. The matter ought not to end here; for the sake of the purity of the police administration of this district the suspicion aroused ought to be investigated." Here then is another Daniel pronouncing against the police of Noakhali. Verily, as the "Indian Nation" observes, "There is something rotten in the state of affairs at Noakhali." The latest news is that Mr. Geidt has been recalled also. I am somewhat sceptical about this information. But if it be true, what may it mean?

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

NUMBERS ON RELIEF INCREASING.

In our leading article we summarise from the overland mail the latest available figures regarding famine-relief in India. It will be seen that the numbers are increasing.

In our Parliamentary report will be found a question of which Mr. C. E. Schwann, M.P., has given notice upon the matter.

THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

The Lord Mayor has received a letter from Abdelkader Helmi Pasha, the Chairman of a Committee at Cairo, formed to collect donations in aid of the sufferers by the famine in India, remitting £615 7s. 8d. for that object, which includes a donation of £100 from the Khedive. With this sum the total amount remitted from the Mansion House to the Viceroy of India for relief purposes is £394,021.

THE WOMEN'S LIBERAL FEDERATION AND THE FAMINE.

SEARCHING ENQUIRY DEMANDED.

At the annual Council meetings of the Women's Liberal Federation, held at Birmingham last week, Miss Alison Garland moved the following resolution for the Plymouth Association:—"That in the opinion of this Council it is desirable, with a view to preventing the frequent recurrence of severe famine in India, that a searching enquiry be made in order to ascertain the economic causes, as distinguished from the physical occasion, of famines in that country." Miss Garland said it seemed that an Indian famine was to be a permanent institution of the British Empire. The remedies which her visit to India led her to recommend were the moderation of the land tax, the reduction of public expenditure in India, and especially the reduction of military expenditure, and the creation in Great Britain of as keen an interest in Indian as in home affairs.

Miss Phear seconded, and, referring to a request from the chair to the speakers to be brief, expressed regret that the Indian famine was always considered at the end of the day both at the women's and the men's federation meetings.

Mrs. Sheldon Amos said the Bishop of Calcutta (Dr. Welldon) had requested her to take every opportunity of inviting women to interest themselves in India, and especially in the women of India.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION OF THE BAPTIST UNION.

At the first Session of the Spring Assembly of the Baptist Union, held at Bloomsbury Chapel, Mr. T. Kyffin Freeman, F.G.S., of London, moved the following resolution:—"That whilst fully recognizing the important work accomplished in the past by H.M. Indian Government in mitigating the calamitous effects of famines that have been of such frequent occurrence in certain parts of the Empire through the construction of railways and canals, this Union would respectfully urge upon the Government the need of a more extended system of reservoirs, canals and irrigation works, whereby the risks of famines and starvation would be lessened, if not entirely avoided."

Rev. W. Cuff seconded, urging that all must agree with the motion before them, and thus there was no necessity for any speech to be made.

DR. McLAREN AND INDIAN FAMINES.

Under this heading the "Manchester Guardian" publishes the following letter from Mr. William Digby, C.I.E.:—

On more than one occasion in the recent correspondence published in your columns concerning the condition of the people of India in relation to frequent famines the name of Dr. McLaren has been mentioned, and his sympathy and aid invoked. That sympathy and aid have not been withheld. At the recent session of the Baptist Union Mr. T. Kyffin Freeman introduced a resolution of sympathy with the Indian sufferers, calling upon the Government of India to do all in its power, by irrigation, extension, and in other ways, to render famine impossible. Yesterday Mr. Freeman received the following letter from Dr. McLaren:—

"Carill Drive, Fallowfield, Manchester,
May 4, 1901.

"Dear Mr. Freeman,—We are under obligations to you for bringing the questions of famine in India under the notice of the Baptist Union, and I earnestly hope that the resolution which was passed unanimously, and with much sympathy, by the Assembly may be of some use in strengthening your hands in the action which, I am glad to hear, is contemplated. I believe that I shall be expressing the feeling of the whole of our churches when I express my own profound interest in your attempt to awaken the national conscience to a perception of the horrors of these famines and the possibility of greatly minimising, if not altogether preventing them.—I am, etc.,

"Alexr. McLaren.

"T. Kyffin Freeman, Esq."

The letter does honour to the writer. Now that Dr. McLaren has led the way, will not Bishop Moorhouse follow? And is not the example of the Baptist Union one to cause the Board of Directors of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce to reconsider their recent decision?

AN APPEAL.

The following letter appears in the "Belfast News-Letter":—

Sir,—Permit me to say, through you, that Western India is face to face with famine. The Rev. W. C. Whiteside, formerly of Belfast, now working under the C.M.S., writes as follows in the "Gleaner":—"The earth seems to be dried up, only the best wells have water, and that in ever-decreasing quantity. From all sides the cry of our Christians reaches me. Being of low caste, they are not permitted to draw from the farmers' wells, and there is little or no water elsewhere. In this emergency we must dig wells for our people, or they must migrate; but this does not solve the difficulty, for wherever they go the same difficulty of drawing water will meet them." The first crop this year was much below the average. Many had neither bullocks to prepare the fields nor seed to sow. The second crop has received too little rain, and most of it will return no grain to these poor people. This outlook is very sad. I will gladly receive any funds to help Mr. Whiteside in this distressing state of famine and destitution in Western India. It may be added that I was able to send him £50 last year through the kind thoughtfulness of friends in Belfast and vicinity. I never allow a sum of £5 to lie in my hands for a single day. I go at once to the Bank of Ireland and get a draft and post it at once direct to Mr. Whiteside in Aurangabad. Help for this will be most gratefully received by

John Magee.

22, Castle Lane, Belfast.

INDIAN NATIONALITY.

NOTABLE SERMON BY THE BISHOP OF BOMBAY.

The Rev. James MacArthur, D.D., Lord Bishop of Bombay, preaching in St. Paul's Cathedral on April 24 last, at the annual service of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, took for his text (Acts iv. 12):—"Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." In the course of his sermon, Dr. MacArthur said:—

I welcome the great opportunity which the annual sermon of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel gives me of speaking of the missionary work of the Church in India.

I approach the subject with diffidence, for as yet my experience has not been long. I speak with a deep sense of responsibility, for I appreciate fully the difficulties with which the subject abounds. I speak as one who is entirely loyal to the position adopted by our Government in India, and to the obligations by which it is bound. I speak with the heart-felt respect of one who has conceived a high esteem for the people of India, and whose ambition is, if God will, to understand them, to deserve and to win their friendship, to serve them with wisdom and with sympathy in all departments of their social life, and to be a fellow-worker with them in all that may further their national welfare.

It is not my purpose to give an account of the operations of this Society and of other Societies representing Christianity in India. For this there will be other opportunities. Here, in this cathedral, which we think of wherever we may be as the heart and centre of the life of our Church as far as any earthly institution can serve that function, we meet as Christian men desiring inspiration for the duty which God has called us to do. We meet to pray for wisdom to apprehend our task, for courage to compass it, for the clear eye, for the sober judgment, for the prudent method, for the illuminated purpose, for the steadfast will which we know to be necessary, and which God alone can give.

The subject I desire to consider is this—the bearing of St. Peter's statement on the life of the people of India. That it applies to them as to all men we cannot doubt. They need salvation as all men need it. But what does that mean? What sort of salvation does St. Peter speak of? What are the obligations of Christians in view of the statement that it is to be found in Christ alone?

I have already remarked on the probability that national salvation was chiefly before the apostle's mind when he uttered the words of which we are thinking. It was the need which, above all others, was constantly present to the mind of the Jews. The passion for independence, for liberty, for the dignity of national existence, for the restoration of the glories of the past, had burned in their hearts for centuries. Their attitude towards Christ was determined by their sense of that need. For a time they had believed that in Him their hopes would be realized. But they saw that His conception was different from theirs. What it was they refused to consider; the worldly passion was too strong in them. It was some sort of distant ideal. They wanted to grasp a present boon. Hence they rejected Him and put Him to death.

St. Peter, speaking with the influence which a work of power accomplished in Christ's name might give to his words, assured them earnestly that they had made a mistake. From their own point of view, for the realization of their own desires, they had committed an error. Christ was the only foundation, the corner-stone on whom alone the fabric of national glory could be built. They had turned away from Him; they were looking for another. They believed that their Saviour was yet to come. But it was a vain hope, a futile expectation, a delusive and ruinous dream, for He alone could save them and the nation of which they were the guides and the leaders, "neither was there salvation in any other, for there was none other name under heaven given among men whereby they must be saved."

Now, I am far from saying that there is any close analogy between the present circumstances of the people of India and those of the Jews in the time of Christ. In most respects they are widely different, but in the one deep desire of which I have spoken, the one conscious longing, the one felt need ever present to their minds, they do, I think, resemble each other. The craving for independence, for liberty, for recovered nationality, for powers and opportunities of self-government according to indigenous views and instincts, corresponds very closely to the ruling passion in the heart of the Jews. It is not, indeed, diffused among the people to the same extent, for there are millions in India who are incapable of realizing their national position, and who have no desires beyond a peaceful life and a frugal maintenance. But among the educated, those who are the natural leaders of the people, whose lives are identified with India, who have nothing to look for from Western sources, whose only prospects lie in the progress of their country, the craving is deep and strong. It explains the restlessness which is observable on the surface of Indian life, the discontent, the fretfulness, the disposition to criticise, the tone of bitterness, the temper of suspicion and seeming unfriendliness. It is easy to mistake the significance of these things, to interpret them as evidences of a seditious spirit and an attitude of disloyalty to our Government. I am convinced that they mean no such thing. The proofs of widespread, strong, intelligent loyalty are far more general and conclusive than any seeming indications of an opposite spirit. The people are fully conscious of the advantages they owe to us. If they do not exactly like the foreigner, they esteem and trust him all the same. The Chiefs and leading men are eager to help us with their resources and their services in every time of need. We who witnessed the aspect of Bombay on the day of the funeral of our late beloved Queen could have only one emotion of deep thankfulness and joy because of the evident loyalty and love in the hearts of all classes of the people. What do the appearances which I have noticed indicate? Nothing, I believe, but the aspiration for a resuscitated national existence. They are the chafings of proud and eager natures under restraints and hindrances and limitations which the established order places upon them. The minds which we have enlightened and educated, to which, through intimate contact with them, we have imparted our ideas, and some of our characteristics and capabilities, feel that they are fettered and restricted. They think that they cannot attain what their abilities and acquirements would command in other circumstances. They are sensitive, and no doubt, to some extent, they exaggerate their privations. They ask themselves why they should not be as other peoples, with a fair field, with free opportunities. They have seized a political ideal, viz., that of self-government under British paramountcy. They are labouring in the press, and on platforms, in townships, and villages, to work this ideal into the minds and hearts of the people. It is this eager purpose which explains their chafings and their frettings, their partial undisciplined and petulant utterances. We cannot censure the ideal. Philosophical minds among them are aware that the time is not yet, and that progress to be sound must be slow. But they want to move in the right direction. They are jealous of influences which tend to obscure the ideal, or to promote what they think injurious developments. They are jealous especially of anything which tends towards absorption into the vortex of Western thought, Western ideas, Western politics, Western aims. They resent anything which tends to impair the strength and individuality of the Eastern character. They want to think as Orientals, to reason as Orientals, to strive together as Orientals, towards the attainment of a true Oriental nationality and the realization of Oriental aims.

This condition of mind has seemed to me of late to interpret the attitude of the educated Native mind to Christianity. There is on the one hand a widespread appreciation, founded often on an intelligent knowledge, of the Christian religion, and there is on the other hand a fixed determination not to embrace, or at least to profess, it. Educated men are interested in Christian theology. They study the Bible. They read it devotionally. A Hindu father will sometimes, as a moral and spiritual exercise, read daily the Psalms with his son. They would admit, I think, in many cases, the superiority of the Bible to any other sacred literature. We know that some of those at least who represent the Native mind would welcome the reading of the Bible in Government Schools as a literary model and a book of high ethical value. We could not, of course, tolerate such a proposal as this, but it is instructive as indicating the attitude of mind. So, again, the Personality of Christ is profoundly reverenced, even if the Christian doctrine of His Person be rejected as inconsistent with Hindu philosophy and incompatible with Hindu modes of thought.

Further, we may say with confidence that multitudes of educated Hindus, and perhaps Mahomedans as well, are at heart Christians. But they won't profess Christianity, they won't be baptised, they won't join the Christian fellowship. That is a course which they consider impossible. It is not to be thought of; they put it on one side. Whatever considerations might be urged in favour of it, even the secret sense of duty in their minds, are outweighed by stronger reasons against it. How are we to explain this? It is not altogether the fear of losing caste; that is a weaker motive than it was, and is becoming weaker every day. It is not the interference with social relationships, the severance of family ties. There is something stronger holding them back. It is, I believe, the sacred trust of nationality. Religion and nationality are closely connected. The one powerfully affects the other. To embrace the Western religion would go far to impair the Native character. It would mean the loss of what is distinctive, traditional, essential. That is the thought they cannot endure. They want to be a Hindu nation, not a nation of Hindus converted into Westerns. By consenting to this they would lose their individuality, their strength, their claim. And as the resuscitated nationality is to them the most sacred goal of their lives, they steadfastly reject as inadmissible the proposition of becoming Christians. Here is the explanation of the phenomena of Indian life, often apparently inconsistent and perplexing—the renaissance of the Sanskrit learning, the enthusiasm for the Vedic books, and Upanishads, and Darsanas, and Epics, the energy of Congress with its modified, enlightened, and more reasonable tone, the temper of the press, the attitude towards Christianity, the substitution of eclectic systems for those who can no longer remain Hindus, and who must not be allowed to become Christians—all are explained by the same great motive—to preserve, to train, to strengthen a new and vigorous Hindu nationality.

The accomplishment of what is desired would surely be in harmony with English ideas and aims. The training of a wise, intelligent, and responsible people, united among themselves and capable of self-government, would be the triumph of English administration of India. In present circumstances it may seem a distant goal, but it is one to remember and to strive towards. Each generation ought to make its contribution and record its advance in the right direction. The question is how best to do this, how most surely to approach the end in view? To this there is only one answer. Everything depends on character, and the training of character is the chief necessity. The Jews in the time of Christ made a great mistake in supposing that all they needed was a leader; that if the proper man were forthcoming, the kind of man whom they connected in their mind with the name and office of Messiah, the nation under his influence and guidance would at once attain the coveted place. They assumed that the qualities essential to independence and national greatness were present if only there were the man to draw them out. Our Lord knew that what the people needed was reformation. They had lost the characteristics which make nations free and great. The task before them was the building up of the inward virtue, wisdom, integrity, and godliness which alone could prevail in the struggle of nations, and which when they are present command the place that belongs to them. We may, without offence, say that the majority of the people of India have not yet the qualities which the attainment of their ideals demands. The task before them is one of discipline and education. To be effectual education must proceed under a guiding and inspiring moral influence. The question is where this is to be found. The absence of moral and religious instruction in the training of the youth of India is deplored by all good men; the difficulty of supplying it is one of the most serious problems of the country. There are many theories. Some think that everything depends on the quality of teachers; others would rely on music and song; others, again, on moral textbooks for furnishing what is required. Can it be said that the religions of India furnish a true and sufficient basis of moral instruction? That question has been discussed in relation to Hinduism by one who knows it from personal experience and careful study better than most men. His conclusion is that if such a basis is to be found in Hindu theology at all, it can only be in the doctrine of Transmigration, and he does not think that that supplies it, inasmuch as it teaches that "at each death consciousness is so interrupted that the precise sins or successes of a previous existence are not remembered, but can only be guessed at by their effect," . . . . "and that after innumerable periods of probation, and upon a most complicated balance of countless transactions, there is a final judgment day, at which the person is absolved or condemned without the faintest recollection of what he has done, or without any explanation or summing up on the part of a superior power*."

If the needful foundation of moral instruction cannot be found in Hinduism, no more can we find it in Mahommedanism. Neither in the conception of God which that system educates, nor in the conception of blessedness hereafter which it sets before its faithful followers, is there anything to develop the moral faculty or to quicken the higher desires. If, on the other hand, we take the moral teaching of Christ, and separate it as far as possible from the more theological and transcendental aspects of the Christian system, we find that it is incomparable as a guide to moral conduct in its simplicity, its plainness, its directness, its explicitness. With respect to this there can be no controversy. It is a fact which I believe is admitted by all the more educated and impartial Indian minds.

If that be so, it surely follows that Christianity is what is chiefly needed for the education of the Indian people. Sympathising with them as we do, desiring to further their nobler aspirations, feeling that the attainment of what they desire would be the crowning fruit of our relations with them, we believe and are sure that we can render them the highest service, and be fellow-workers with them in the best and most practical way, by exhibiting our intense belief in the religion of Christ as the moral agency which makes for the strength and glory of nations, and which enables them more than any other power or influence to progress towards the attainment of their destiny. For what does Christianity teach?

A true conception of God as a personal being whom man may know, and who knows every one of His creatures with the loving, watchful, discriminating knowledge that an earthly father has for his child.

A true conception of the present life, which trains men to think of it not as a dispensation of weariness and sorrow, emancipation from which is the goal of human desire, but as a blessed opportunity of happy energy and unselfish service, leading on to yet ampler opportunities of nobler service in the life hereafter.

A true conception of duty as something which we owe to Him who has made us what we are, who has appointed our circumstances, who has set before us our opportunities, who has revealed Himself to us in a character of wisdom and righteousness, and tenderness and love, which sheds a perpetual sunlight on all life's experiences.

A conception of the future life as a continuation and development of the present life, affording a glorious and blessed contrast to the grotesque and hideous dream of transmigration which suggests a succession of births that is virtually endless. "Ah, this fearful round of births," exclaimed the Marathi poet Tukaram, "this weary coming and going, when will it all end?" And when it does end, what does it end in? Not in conscious blessedness and in opportunities of exalted, never-ending service, but in absorption in the Infinite and extinction of the personal and conscious life.

What are the things which we want for India?

First an intense belief in the minds of our countrymen here and there in the religion of Christ as the one regenerating national agency. This must be gained before we can hope to obtain the enthusiasm, the confidence, the loving persuasiveness which are needful to commend it to the minds and hearts of peoples to whom its teachings are as yet unknown. We want to think of our religion, not as one creed among others, a philosophy, a sentiment, a doctrine, a groping after the mysteries of life here and hereafter—a transcendental theory based on uncertainties—but as the message of salvation from God to man—the one secret of happiness, of progress, of well-being; the remedy for sin, the compensation for weakness, the revelation of truth, the guide to duty, the foundation of hope for the life which now is and for that which is to come, the indispensable instrument for enabling individuals to attain the fullness of the possibilities which God has planted in them, and of the advancement of nations which individuals compose.

In India there is among our countrymen a deep and earnest desire and purpose to do the best that can be done for India. They are not self-seeking, as is sometimes thought, desiring to drain the country of its resources for their own enrichment and then to leave it. Many of the best and ablest of our brethren sacrifice all that they have—their intellectual powers, their capabilities of work, their educational acquirements, their strength, their health, their family companionships. They sacrifice these things loyally and willingly, rejoicing to spend them for the greater good of India. But perhaps they think too often that the future of India is to be built up by that kind of sacrifice. They believe intensely in good government, in justice, in philanthropy, in the development of friendly relations with the people. They forget the one thing needful, or they fail to give it its proper place. They have yet, in the general case, to learn that the religion of Christ is the essential condition for the realisation of the highest purposes which they dedicate their lives to promote.

We want sympathy for Christian missions in India. At present that is withheld. There is coldness, indifference, suspicion, unfriendliness, a low estimate of the social and spiritual work they are silently doing throughout the country. On the one hand there are the liberal acknowledgments of many prominent and well-instructed Indian statesmen of the value of that work. On the other hand there is prevailing popular distrust and the determination to hold aloof from it. It is a sadly discouraging condition of things. We have need to pray that truer views with respect to Christian missions may grow up in the minds of our countrymen in India.

*Sir A. C. Lyall, "Asiatic Studies," Second Series, pp. 12, 13.

We have need of more men and of the best that England can send us to labour in our missions. It is a noble vocation. The country is full of interest. The work to be done, educational and social as well as spiritual, affords incomparable opportunities for the congenial exercise of the powers of the ablest and most cultured men. A missionary who is a scholar, a man of refinement and of breadth of mind, with discernment to grasp the situation and tact and wisdom to cope with it, is a man of power in India. The necessity is that he should identify himself with the country, mastering its languages, its literature, its habits of thought, spending his life in acquainting himself with the people. There are few who do this. The knowledge of the great majority of Englishmen in India is shallow and partial. It requires the unreserved gift of a life if it is to be a thing of power. But if that gift be made the reward is not doubtful—intellectual pleasure, fascinating interest, social and spiritual power—a power far sweeter to the human spirit than any acquirement of salaries, or pensions, or official status. Young Englishmen of ability, education and refinement, have a power within their reach which they may indeed be proud to dedicate as Christian missionaries to the development of a Christian civilisation, and a strong and hopeful nationality in India.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI AND LORD G. HAMILTON.

We have received the following correspondence for publication:—

Washington House,
72, Anerley Park, S.E.
October 12, 1900.

My Lord,—I am not writing this as a formal or controversial letter, or with the object of raising any controversy, though I shall be glad if favoured with a reply. I have no other motive than the combined good of England and India. I hope it will be taken by your lordship in its proper spirit, and I, therefore, write freely.

After the clear decision of the British people of a noble policy and even after the great solemn Proclamation of the Sovereign in confirmation of that noble policy, the efforts which have been made from time to time either to check the admission of Indians into, or when already admitted to sweep them out again by subtle means from, various services, are the sowings of little seeds; and though their bitter fruit may not be reaped in our time, the bitter fruit must and will come in some form or other, and future British generations, who will have to taste the bitter fruit, will curse the hands that have marred the noble policy and sown the bitter seeds.

As a sample of the present strong feeling against such acts I enclose a cutting from the "Kaisir-i-Hind" of 16th of last month, and I may say that a similar cry is raised with respect to the Public Works and other services in all the Indian papers which I have seen. The time is past when the "subterfuges," as Lord Lytton called them, of the authorities to violate a great and noble policy were not understood.

New generations (thanks, many thanks, to this one blessed Act of the British) have received the blessings of education; and they now realise the present un-British violation of all pledges, however masked it is by misleading, plausible statements.

I do not know whether the expression of the Indian Press comes to your knowledge. I am afraid you do not realise at all the mischief that is now being stored up.

That the action of the authorities about the services is immensely injurious and impoverishing to the Indians goes without saying; but what I desire most anxiously to impress is that it is suicidal to the British rule itself and to British greatness.

What poor India's future fate will be it is not easy to say. Whether under the persistence of the present evil bleeding system it will fall from the British frying pan into the Russian fire or free itself from a destructive rule, or whether a return to the original noble policy will take *place before it is too late*, and a mighty and prosperous British Indian Empire will be consolidated and will endure against all comers, with the vast physical and warlike resources of India backed by staunch loyalty.

The only pity is that while a blessed connexion can be positively formed by which the two countries can be indissolubly bound up together to the immense benefit of both, by an honourable and righteous performance of Britain's solemn pledges, the authorities, by some strange fatality, blindly and suicidally persist in following a dishonourable, selfish and destructive un-English course!

Secretaries of State and Governments of India are all-powerful; we are utterly powerless and at their mercy. They can inflict upon us whatever injustice they like, which we are helpless to prevent. But there is justice in heaven, and retribution will come as sure as night follows day. Lord Salisbury has truly said, "Injustice will bring down the mightiest on earth to ruin." Only that is no consolation to the present scores of millions of sufferers in poverty, famine and diseases.

You will see in the enclosed cutting that there is a panic, that the authorities are tending towards stopping even in this country the competition of Indians for the Civil Service, and that the subtle encroachments on the various other services are but a prelude to that disaster.

Now, this is not an idle fear that has overtaken the Indian mind. They know very well by sad experience that when the authorities make up their mind to do a thing, however unjust, by "subterfuge" they are sure to accomplish it.

The Government of India, in their despatch of May 2, 1878, coolly proposed to perpetrate three or four outrageous injustices, one of which was to stop the Indians from competing for the Civil Service. It fortunately happened that the Secretary of State of that time (Lord Cranbrook, and I think you were the Under-Secretary of State) had a conscience and sense of justice, and he frustrated the evil proposals. The Government of India then bided their time, and, ultimately, with similarly minded Secretaries of State, and by the "subterfuge" of the Public Service Commission[1], carried two or three of those evil proposals of foregone conclusions of 1878. The only thing which they have not yet carried is the outrageous proposal in cold blood that the ordinary Covenanted Civil Service should be no longer open to Natives. No wonder, therefore, that the sad experience of the action of the authorities has again created the panic about the Civil Service. I hope, however, that the wickedness of violating the noble policy of 1833, 1858, 1877, and 1887, will not go so far.

I do not know what our fate is to be for the next six years. Your last speech on the Budget has struck a few notes of sympathy. This has revived my hopes that we may yet have a better fate of justice at your hands.

I assure you, my lord, that it is no pleasure to me to complain. I am not writing this letter in anger but in agony. If you could but at all realise the utter helplessness and despair we feel against every injustice and injury inflicted upon us by those who ought to be our protectors, you will understand our anguish.

If you become once more our ruler I appeal to you to reconsider the unfortunate retrograde steps which have been lately taken, as well as the already existing injustices and injuries of the last two-thirds of the expiring century. There is also the other subject which demands your sympathetic and protecting consideration, viz., a fair and just apportionment of charge for all purposes in which both England and India are interested. Indians have a right to look upon the Secretary of State for India and the Government of India as their natural protectors against any unjust burdens that may be cast upon them.

Will it ever be, or not, our good fortune, and I must say the good fortune of Britain itself, that some statesman will arise who will have the true British courage and capacity to fulfil faithfully and honourably the most solemn and legal bindings and pledges of the great British people?

With hope, I remain,
Yours truly,
DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Rt. Hon. Lord George Hamilton.
India Office.

Washington House,
72, Anerley Park, S.E.
November 28, 1900.

My Lord,—Since writing to your lordship on 12th ult. it is settled that you will continue to be our ruler for the next six years.

I leave the past alone. I start with the hope which I expressed in my last letter arising in me from the few sympathetic notes you struck in your Budget speech. Keeping in mind the future only I shall write freely.

I wish to draw attention to a principle which has been England and India's bane, and which was repudiated on the very first enactment of British policy towards India.

Macaulay said, on the occasion when "that wise, that benevolent, that noble clause" was before Parliament for enactment in 1833, to settle once for all Britain's policy in India: "*Propter vitam vivendi perdere causas* is a despicable policy either in individuals or in States. In the present case such a policy would be not only despicable but absurd. . . . . It will be allowed by every statesman of our time that the prosperity of a community is made up of the prosperity of those who compose the community. . . . . To trade with civilised men is infinitely more profitable than to govern savages. That would indeed be a doting wisdom which, in order that India might remain a dependency, would keep it a useless and costly dependency; which would keep a hundred millions [now two hundred and fifty millions] of men from being our customers in order that they might continue to be our slaves.

"It was, as Bernier tells us, the practice of the miserable tyrants whom he found in India, when they dreaded the capacity and spirit of some distinguished subject, and yet could not venture to murder him, to administer to him a daily dose of the pousta, a preparation of opium, the effect of which was in a few months to destroy all the bodily and mental powers of the wretch who was drugged with it, and to turn

[1] "Indian Expenditure and Apportionment Commission." Vol. III, Cd. 130, 1900, pp. 485-6, paras. 158-168.

him into a helpless idiot. That detestable artifice, more horrible than assassination itself, was worthy of those who employed it. It is no model for the English nation. We shall never consent to administer the pousta to a whole community, to stupefy and paralyse a great people whom God has committed to our charge for the wretched purpose of rendering them more amenable to our control. We are free, we are civilised to little purpose, if we grudge to any portion of the human race an equal measure of freedom and civilisation. . . . . I have no fears. The path of duty is plain before us, and it is also the path of wisdom, of national prosperity, of national honour."

These British, honourable, and noble words were uttered sixty-seven years ago, and, sad to say, they are as much needed to-day as they were when uttered with the conviction that: "I have no fears. The path of duty is plain before us, and it is the path of wisdom, of national prosperity, of national honour."

I commend with earnestness the whole of that noble speech. The Act was passed; and since 1833 our Sovereign has thrice proclaimed her noble promises. But alas! the great and noble policy, worthy of the British civilisation and humanity, has been openly and ruthlessly violated. The time has come, or is coming fast, when the system of administering the pousta must end. It cannot endure long without disaster.

It is the Conservative party and Secretary of State at whose hands we received the great Proclamation of 1858. It was the Conservative party and Secretaries of State under whom that great and solemn pledge was repeated and confirmed in 1877 and 1887. And is it too much to expect that the Conservative party and Secretary of State should rise to their professions and earn the blessings of a fifth of the human race, and, as a natural consequence, of the whole human race, should consolidate the British Power on the rock of righteousness, and by far enhance the prosperity of the British people themselves?

After my last letter I sent you some Indian papers, showing what dissatisfaction was beginning, and notwithstanding that the sword of the new foolish and suicidal Sedition law is hanging on their heads the Indian papers are speaking out their bitterness and despair.

If we are not yet, as well as Britain, fortunate enough to get the man who will have the British courage, capacity, and righteousness to redress all our past wrongs, and found the Empire in our gratitude and affection, do not, pray, let new wrongs arise to snatch away even what little has been already obtained for us, as in the action about the Engineering College, higher educational service, police department, and in various ways making more and more invidious and unjust distinctions. Do pray consider this.

I do not see any reason why you yourself should not be able to do a great deal towards redressing the past wrongs and preventing future wrongs.

The people, and especially the educated, are yet thoroughly and really loyal, as much as when it was declared by the Government of India itself in 1880. In its despatch of June 8, 1880, it bore this emphatic testimony: "To the mind of at least the educated among the people of India—and the number is rapidly increasing—any idea of the subversion of the British power is abhorrent from the consciousness that it must result in the widest anarchy and confusion." But here is your own testimony uttered only four days ago (23rd inst.), and it is quite true at present. You said: "And that in time of trouble, so far from India being a source of disquietude and weakness to Great Britain it would be found to be a source of strength."

But I ask any sane man to say whether this abhorrence to subversion and this source of strength can continue under the persistence of the present system of violation of most solemn pledges, and of flagrant and insidious injustices, leaving helotry as our only lot and reward.

The rising and coming generations would not stand as patiently as the passing generations, the accumulating injustices with their dire consequences of famines, plagues, etc., etc., and material, mental and moral degradation and deterioration.

I raise my humble warning voice not to let matters drift till it is too late to prevent the devastation which must come. Lord Roberts has truly said: "But however efficient and well-equipped the army of India may be, were it, indeed, absolute perfection, and were its members considerably more than they are at present, our greatest strength must ever rest on the firm basis of a united and contented India."

A discontented India will be Britain's greatest weakness. It is not too late yet. The feeling in favour of British connexion is very strong yet, and every effort in the direction of a more just and righteous conduct than that of the dying century, in fact, a reversion to the "wise, benevolent, and noble" policy laid down in 1833, 1858, 1877, and 1887, will be the further deepening and strengthening of the present deep and sincere loyalty.

My lord, the present drain and the increasing destitution and impoverishment of the people ought not to continue.

To revert to our gracious Sovereign's pledges on behalf of the British people is now the thing needed to realise her best and noblest wishes:—

"In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward."

And to accomplish this she has prayed: "And may the God of all power grant to us, and *to those in authority under us*, strength to carry out these our wishes for the good of our people."

And this is our prayer.

I remain,
Yours truly,
DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Rt. Hon. Lord George Hamilton,
India Office.

P.S.—This letter has been delayed in forwarding. I have to-day received a reply to my letter of October 12 last, for which I am very thankful. I shall reply to it.

India Office, Whitehall, London, S.W.
November [27], 1900.

Sir,—I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of October 12 last, on the subject of the recruitment of Natives of India for the Government services in that country: and more especially with reference to an answer recently given by his lordship to a question in the House of Commons regarding the new rules for admission to the Royal Indian Engineering College at Coopers Hill.

His lordship, whilst declining to enter into a general discussion with you as to what should be the constituent parts of the Civil Services of the Government of India, repudiates the construction you have thought fit to put upon the measures recently taken to regulate and control the public employment of Natives of India. He desires me to call your attention to a speech made by Sir Henry Fowler, when Secretary of State for India, on August 15, 1894, in which the principle is clearly stated that it is indispensable that a minimum proportion of the Indian Civil Services should always be Europeans; and that so long as India is governed by the British Crown this condition is evidently essential to the maintenance there of British administration. It was further shown in the same debate that this principle is in no way opposed to the admission of Natives of India, as they become qualified and as the conditions of the country permit, to a very large number of offices in the administration, and that this number has been steadily increasing. His lordship, like his predecessors, is of opinion that a majority of the more important controlling posts must remain in the hands of Europeans, but, subject only to this condition, he is entirely in favour of the maintenance of the access of Indians to public employment, and has done nothing since he has been Secretary of State to impede it.

As regards the particular case of the Coopers Hill College, the facts are as stated in Lord George Hamilton's answer to the question in the House of Commons of August 27 last. While that College was established and is maintained to supply European officers from this country to the Public Works Department in India, there exist in India four colleges in which Natives of India are trained for admission to the same service, and the article in the newspaper which you enclose is incorrect in stating that Europeans and others who are not Natives of India as defined by law are not excluded from them. The highest appointments in the services are open to Natives of India admitted from the Indian colleges. As explained in his lordship's answer above mentioned, the average of admissions of Natives of India to the Indian Public Works Department through the Coopers Hill College has hitherto been one a year; it follows, therefore, that in fixing two appointments annually as the number available in future for them his lordship has made sufficient allowance for an increase in the recruitment of Natives of India through this channel, in addition to that afforded by the Indian colleges. His lordship considers that in the Public Works Department, as in the Indian Civil Service, an adequate proportion of European officers is at present indispensable; and he would be much surprised to find that anyone practically acquainted with the details of Indian administration disputed this proposition.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
A. GODLEY.

Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq.,
Washington House, Anerley Park, S.E.

(To be continued.)

Imperial Parliament.

Tuesday, May 7.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

Mr. CREMER asked the Secretary of State for India if he would state what number of commissioned officers were on the establishment of the Indian Armies on January 1, 1901, and how many of them were British and how many Native.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The number of commissioned officers on the active list of the establishment of the Indian Armies on January 1, 1901, was 4,679; of these 1,836 were British, and 2,843 were Native.

Thursday, May 9.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BOER PRISONERS IN INDIA.

Mr. James O'Connor asked the Secretary of State for War whether he was aware that a number of the Bombay sappers had arrived at Ahmednagar and were putting up a high barbed wire entanglement to inclose the iron roofed huts in which Boer prisoners were to be detained; could he say why the Boer prisoners were to be lodged in iron roofed huts; what was the necessity for the barbed wire entanglement; and upon whose authority it had been erected.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have not received any information of the nature referred to, but I have no doubt the military authorities in India will carry out the duty imposed upon them by providing suitable accommodation for the prisoners, and by taking proper precautions against their escape.

Mr. Dillon asked if the wire entanglement was part of the suitable accommodation.

Lord G. Hamilton said it was part of the precautions taken against escape, and similar precaution was taken when English, Irish, and Scotch soldiers were prisoners of war at Pretoria. (Hear.)

Mr. Dillon remarked that war did not prevail in India.

PEASANT INDEBTEDNESS.
MR. S. S. THORBURN'S REPORT.

Mr. Caine asked the Secretary of State for India if he would lay upon the Table of the House the Report and Appendices thereto on Peasant Indebtedness and Land Alienations to Money Lenders in Parts of the Rawal Pindi Division, made by Mr. S. S. Thorburn, Commissioner of that Division, dated May 1, 1896.

Lord G. Hamilton: The Report and Appendices to which the honourable member refers are very lengthy, and could not be published except as part of a correspondence which, as a whole, would form a bulky volume. I do not think that I should be justified in laying it upon the Table of the House, but I shall be prepared to let the honourable member see a copy if he wishes it.

Mr. Caine: I do not wish to put the Department to unnecessary expense. The document need not be printed, if it is laid so that hon. Members may see it.

Lord G. Hamilton: I think I can do that.

Friday, May 10.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE P. AND O. COMPANY AND LASCAR SEAMEN.

Mr. Joyce asked the President of the Board of Trade whether he could state if the Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company were now providing the Lascar seamen on the vessels of their fleet with 72 cubic feet of space as accommodation, as specified in section 210 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894: Whether he could now state if the lawsuit which the Board of Trade had during the past 18 months been endeavouring to arrange with this company, with a view to testing whether the Imperial Merchant Shipping Act applied to Lascars serving on board British ships, was likely to be heard: And, whether he could explain the delay in its being brought before the Courts.

Mr. Gerald Balfour: The Peninsular and Oriental Company do not in all cases provide their Lascar seamen with the space required by section 210 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894. When space is not so provided no deduction from tonnage with respect to the deficient space is allowed. The petition of right presented by the Peninsular and Oriental Company was duly fiated by the Attorney-General towards the end of last year, and the answer on behalf of the Crown has been delivered. No undue delay has occurred in bringing the proceedings to this point, and it may be expected that the petition will be set down for hearing shortly.

INDIAN PRINCES AND FOREIGN TRAVEL.

Mr. MacNeill asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been directed to an order issued by the Governor General of India forbidding Indian Princes to travel abroad or visit Europe without the Viceroy's Imperial permission; was he aware that this order had caused discontent; and would he state on what grounds this order was made, and whether it was made with the knowledge and sanction of the Home Government.

Lord G. Hamilton: I am cognisant of the circular letter to which the hon. member's question evidently refers, though I cannot accept his description of it as an accurate one. It was within the competence of the Government of India to issue it; no sanction from the Home Government was requisite; and I am not aware that it has caused discontent.

Mr. MacNeill asked under what provision had Lord Curzon any right to interfere with the private arrangements of these Princes.

Lord G. Hamilton: I do not think that the hon. gentleman has quite mastered the situation. The authority and power of the Indian Government have behind them the support and authority of the Indian Princes, and if the Indian Princes leave their territory they are, in consequence, protected from disturbance or disquietude inside their territory. Therefore it is not unreasonable that the Indian Government should ask that they should be consulted in regard to the frequency and duration of absence from India, during which the reigning Princes abandon the reins of authority in their own country.

Monday, May 13.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Financial Statement, 1901-2),—Return Presented, —"Copy of the Indian Financial Statement for 1901-2, and of the proceedings of the Legislative Council of the Governor General thereon."—(Sir Henry Fowler.)—To lie upon the table, and be printed.

East India (Estimate),—Copy presented,—of Estimate of Revenue and Expenditure of the Government of India for 1900-1901, compared with the results of 1899-1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 172.]

East India (Finance and Revenue Accounts),—Copy presented,—of Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India for 1899-1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Home Accounts),—Copy presented,—of Home Accounts of the Government of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 173.]

LIQUOR SHOPS.

Mr. Samuel Smith asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the increased facilities for drinking now being granted by the revenue authorities in Madras Presidency, by which the number of liquor shops in that Presidency were increased during 1899-1900 by 407, in opposition to the Resolution of the House of Commons of April 30, 1889, condemning any increase in the facilities for drinking in India: Whether, seeing that there were drinking bars in Calcutta, Bombay, and other large cities, where women were employed, and that the Government of Burma had decided to prohibit the employment of women in public-houses in that province, he would consider the advisability of extending that reform to the whole of India: And, whether he had any information showing that in spite of the fact that the unlicensed sale of cocaine in Bengal had stopped, and licences had now to be taken out by dealers at considerable expense, the consumption of cocaine was steadily increasing; and, if so, whether he would consider the advisability of prohibiting the sale of that drug in Bengal except for purely medicinal purposes.

Lord G. Hamilton: (1) I am aware that while the number of arrack-shops in the Madras Presidency decreased in 1899-1900, the number of toddy-shops was somewhat higher than in the previous year owing to provision for what were considered to be the reasonable requirements of the people. There has been no departure from the policy of restricting the shops to such reasonable requirements, and as compared with 1891-2 the latest number shows a reduction of 3,152, or 10 per cent.; (2) I have no information to justify action in the matter of the employment of women in public houses; (3) In October last the Government of Bengal placed the sale of cocaine under the restrictions applying to the sale of intoxicating drugs. I have no evidence that its consumption is increasing notwithstanding these restrictions.

Tuesday, May 14.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BRITISH INDIAN REFUGEES IN NATAL.

Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if any reply had been received to the enquiry he had addressed to Sir A. Milner regarding the refusal of permits to British Indian subjects to return to the Transvaal from Natal; and, if so, would he state what the reply was, and if the permits had been issued to them as they had been in the case of other refugees for some time past.

Mr. Chamberlain: The following is the reply received from Sir Alfred Milner:—"Two representatives of Indian traders have been given permits, one from Durban, one from Cape Town. Statements in telegram of Indian committee incorrect. No one allowed to come up except required for re-opening of mines and for necessary trade. Great majority of European refugees' shops still closed, including nearly all the small ones. All civil permits to men issued on the condition that recipients join Rand Rifles. This does not seem advisable in case of Indians, and to allow them up without this restriction would cause great discontent. No women allowed up at present except wives of certain classes of officials, or Government employes."

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS.

Notice has been given of the following questions:—

Mr. Caine,—To ask the Secretary of State for India, if it is intended to establish a bishopric in the Central Provinces of India; and, if so, what cost will it involve to the Indian Exchequer.—(Thursday, May 16.)

Mr. Schwann,—To ask the Secretary of State for India, whether he can explain why telegrams from the Viceroy regarding the progress of famine in India have not for some weeks past been communicated to the British Press: And, whether he will state what is the present condition of the famine districts and the number of persons in receipt of relief at the present time in each of them separately.—(Thursday, May 16.)

NOTICE OF MOTION.

The following Notice of Motion appears upon the Order Paper of the House of Commons:—

Sir Seymour King,—Coopers Hill College,—To call attention to the Correspondence and Papers laid upon the Table of the House in connexion with educational changes at Coopers Hill College; and to move a resolution.

PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO INDIA.

To be obtained from
THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84-85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Reports of the Proceedings at the Annual Sessions of the Indian National Congress, from the 3rd to the 14th Session. 2s. each, post free.

The Skeleton at the (Jubilee) Feast (Congress Green Book I.), by Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, Bart. (being a series of suggestions for the prevention of famine in India). Post free, 7d.

Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: Evidence-in-Chief of the Indian Witnesses. (Congress Green Book II.) Post free, 1s. 10d.

The Proposed Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions in India. Memorial to the Secretary of State. With two Appendices. (Congress Green Book III.) Post free, 1s. 2d.

Two Statements presented to the Indian Currency Committee (1898), by Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Speech by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., in the House of Commons, August 14, 1894, on the Debate on the Indian Budget.

Ditto do. in the House of Commons, February 12, 1895, on the Debate on the Address.

Ditto do. on British Rule in India (1898).

Presidential Address by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Lahore, 1893.

Presidential Address by Mr. A. M. Bose, M.A., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Madras, 1898.

Speeches of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., President of the Indian National Congress, 1894-5.

Valedictory Address of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., delivered at Bombay, January 17, 1895.

Speeches of Mr. D. E. Wacha delivered at the 9th, 11th and 14th Sessions of the Indian National Congress.

Is the Government of India Responsible to Anyone, and if so to Whom? Speech delivered at Croydon by Mr. W. C. BONNERJEE.

The Famine in India. Speeches delivered at a Public Reception to Mr. Vaughan Nash on his return from the Famine Districts, July, 1900.

Mr. A. O. Hume's Farewell to India. Speech delivered at Bombay, 1894.

India Reform Pamphlet IX. The State and Government of India under its Native Rulers. 3d.

The Indian National Congress: its Aims and Justification. By ROBERT KNIGHT.

Indian Politics. A Series of Papers on Important Indian Questions by Prominent Congressmen. Post free, 4s. 4d.

A Needed Reform in the Indian Administration, by ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

The Bogey of a Russian Invasion. A Lesson from the Tirah Campaign, by Col. H. B. HANNA.

The High Courts and the Collector-Magistrates in India, by J. DACOSTA.

The Government of India and its Reform through Parliamentary Institutions, by J. DACOSTA.

Note on Sir J. Westland's Budget, 1894-5.

Note on the Explanatory Memorandum of the Secretary of State for India, 1894-5.

Note on Sir James Westland's Budget, 1895-6.

Note on Sir H. Waterfield's Tables, 1884-5 to 1894-5.

The Poor Man's Lamb: Famine Insurance for the Masses *versus* Exchange Compensation for the Classes.

REPRINTS FROM "INDIA."

The Judiciary and the Executive in India. Interview with Mr. Manomohan Ghose.

The Bombay Government and Higher Education, by the Hon. C. H. Setalved.

A National Famine Grant, Letter from the London Indian Society to Lord Salisbury, 1900.

India and the General Election (1900).

"Melancholy Meanness."

The "Over-population" Fallacy Again.

No National Contribution?

The "Slimness" of the India Office.

"Mainly a Question of Money."

A Selection of the Publications enumerated above will be forwarded to responsible persons or Associations in the United Kingdom for gratuitous distribution, on written application to the British Committee, Indian National Congress, 84-85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS to "INDIA" 1901.

WHY NOT SUBSCRIBE NOW?

A limited number of new Subscribers can still be supplied with copies of INDIA from the beginning of the present year. SUBSCRIPTIONS (POST FREE) SIX RUPEES.

PREPAID Subscriptions for the REMAINDER OF THE YEAR should be remitted direct to the Office in London at the following rates, which include postage:—

June 1 to end of year..4 rupees.
July 1 to end of year..3 rupees 8 annas.

Do you want to know by every mail what has been done in Parliament concerning India?

Do you want to see special reports of public meetings in England concerning India?

Do you want to read what the British Press is writing about India?

——The Journal "INDIA" will tell you.

Remittances should accompany every order.
Address:—THE MANAGER OF "INDIA,"
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS,
WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

"THE PEOPLE OF INDIA:

Their Many Merits by Many who have Known Them."

Mr. Alfred Webb's articles reprinted in pamphlet form from "INDIA."

A copy will be sent free on receipt of 1d. stamp to cover postage.

Secretaries of Political Associations, Clubs, Literary Societies, in the United Kingdom may obtain copies for distribution on application.

BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

In India, applications should be addressed to
Mr. HARICHANDRA A. TALCHERKAR,
52, Veronica Street, Bandra, Bombay.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Subscription in England:—
June 1 to End of Year (Post free), 5s. 9d.

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2 Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.